

Remarks

Claims 3-5, and 27-36 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bhoj et al. (US Patent No. 6,742,016), hereafter “Bhoj,” in view of Roberts et al. (US Patent No. 6,754,693), hereafter “Roberts.” Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is defective because Bhoj and Roberts, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 3 recites:

“A server for accepting connection requests from client terminals through a network, comprising:

a connection-order setting unit which, upon receiving a first connection request from a first client terminal of said client terminals, sets an order of connection for said first client terminal; and

a connection managing unit for allowing connection of said client terminals according to said order of connection, upon receiving a second connection request from a second client terminal of said client terminals after said first connection request;

wherein a program for automatically executing said second connection request again after a predetermined time interval is transmitted to said client terminal to which said order of connection has been set.”

Regarding claim 3, as admitted by the Examiner, Bhoj does not teach “a program for automatically executing said second connection again is transmitted to said client terminal to which said order of connection has been [set].” To remedy this glaring deficiency in Bhoj, the Examiner relies on the disclosure of Roberts. In particular, the Examiner asserts that “Roberts teaches wherein a program for automatically executing said second connection request again is transmitted to said client terminal to which said order of connection has been set (column 10, lines 7-38; column 16, lines 40-67).” Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s analysis of Roberts.

Applicant submits that the sections of Roberts cited by the Examiner, as well as Roberts taken as a whole, do not disclose, *inter alia*, “wherein a program **for automatically executing said second connection request again after a predetermined time interval** is transmitted to said client terminal to which said order of connection has been set.” On the contrary, none of the applets downloadable by the server 20 in Roberts to a user computer 12 provides this functionality.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 3-5, and 27-36 are allowable. With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place

the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Date: October 2, 2007

John A. Merecki
Reg. No.: 35,812

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)